

## ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

*Personnel*

SUBJECT: (Optional)

NAPA Recommendation on Flow-Through Policy

FROM: Harry E. Fitzwater  
Director of Personnel  
5 E 58

EXTENSION

NO.

DDA 79-2549/1

3 August 1979

TO: (Officer designation, room number and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. Acting Deputy Director  
for Administration

6 August 1979

1 to 3:

2.

3. SA/DDCI

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

I believe that it is clear that the Director of Personnel is charged with developing a coherent personnel system for the Agency based on the NAPA recommendations. The various components of this system are interdependent and should not be dealt with in isolation. This is particularly true with regard to flow-through policy which is an integral part of the personnel planning framework.

The McMahon flow-through paper as modified [redacted] and the various comments thereon should be a useful input to the NAPA Study Group. However, I do not agree with [redacted] recommendation that we should seek approval of the policy at this time and inform the employees.

/s/ C. D. May

Clifford D. May, Jr.  
Acting Deputy Director  
for  
Administration

2 AUG 1979

STAT

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Special Assistant to the DDCI

VIA:

Deputy Director for Administration

FROM:

Harry E. Fitzwater  
Director of Personnel

SUBJECT:

NAPA Recommendation on Flow-Through Policy

REFERENCES:

- a. DDO Paper on Flow-Through
- b. Draft Memo to EXCOM Members fr Secretary, EXCOM, undated, Subject: Clarification of the Agency's Flow-Through Policy (#1)
- c. Memo to EXCOM Members fr Secretary, EXCOM, dated 31 July 1979, Subject: Clarification of the Agency's Flow-Through Policy (#2)

STAT

1. This is to request a clarification of the Office of Personnel's role in processing the subject recommendation. As you are aware, I had requested that products from special assignments; i.e., the DDO's assignment on "Clarifying Flow-Through" and D/EEO's assignment on "EEO Recommendations," be reviewed by the Office of Personnel NAPA Project Group before final decisions by the DDCI and/or the Executive Committee. It was my understanding that the DDCI concurred with my recommendation. Consequently, the NAPA Group has been working with John McMahon's paper, studying the proposed policy's interactions and impacts on other parts of the personnel system.

2. I now find that John's paper has been revised by the Secretary, Executive Committee and the revision sent to the Executive Committee members for comments by 15 August 1979. It is my understanding also that this paper has been forwarded to the DCI for his comments. The

Office of Personnel has not been asked to comment but did receive a copy.

3. It is requested that we again clarify the manner in which the NAPA recommendations are to be processed. I believe the Office of Personnel must be responsible for evaluating all NAPA recommendations and coordinating all actions thereon if we are to ensure that implementing one recommendation does not impact on other parts of the personnel system.

~~Signed~~

Harry E. Fitzwater

cc: Comptroller

Distribution:

Orig & 1 - Addressee  
1 - ER  
2 - DDA *SUB/CHRONO*  
1 - DD/Pers/P&C  
1 - OP/NAPA Project Group  
1 - D/Pers Subject File  
1 - D/Pers Chrono  
1 - HEF Chrono  
D/Pers/HEFitzwater;rj (3 August 1979)

Flow-Through

The NAPA team recommended that CIA clarify the intent and implications of a "flow-through" policy.

For most career cones, flow-through is desirable to maintain an even age/grade distribution which avoids "humps" and ensures reasonable promotion opportunities.

Given reasonably stable ceilings, flow-through should be maintained by coordinating normal attrition, intake and promotion targets. Intake requirements and promotion targets should be reviewed and adjusted annually.

The low three percent mechanism should be applied only to the identification and separation of truly marginal employees.

Forced attrition of productive employees should be considered only when: normal attrition will not permit maintenance of a proper age/grade distribution; to adjust to lower ceilings; or when changing requirements create imbalances in desired distribution of special skills.

When forced attrition is necessary, it should not be applied across the board but rather in those career cones or skill categories where a true surplus exists or is predicted.

Some specialist categories should not be subject to flow-through. For example, in the Operations Directorate, maintaining flow-through in translator/transcriber groups would be both unnecessary and not in the best interests of the service.

C/CMS  
June 1979